

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-49 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 18, 23, 33, and 42 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 12 have been canceled. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-49 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879 to Moran, et al. (hereinafter “Moran”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,294 to Ludwig, et al. (hereinafter “Ludwig”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,765 to Adler, et al. (hereinafter “Adler”).

Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the Interview of March 15, 2007. Pending claims 1, 10, and 23 were discussed with regard to Moran, Ludwig, and Adler.

Applicants argued that Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individual or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations recited in the claims.

Applicants argued that Moran does not teach or suggest the identification of participant directives in recorded meeting data during an ongoing meeting. In Moran, the events (e.g., button presses, notes, etc.) in the recorded meeting data of Moran are indices for activities or actions that have already been performed in a previously completed meeting. Thus, the events in Moran are substantially different from the participant directives recited in the claims that represent actions to be performed during a meeting, such as “COMPUTER, display April shipping orders.” The combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler does not provide the analysis of recorded meeting data while the meeting is ongoing as recited in the claims to identify participant directives in the recorded meeting data that represent actions to be performed during the meeting.

Applicants argued that Moran does not also teach or suggest the performance of the actions represented by the participant directives as recited in the claims once the participant directives are identified in the recorded meeting data. The Examiner has not identified evidence in Moran where events in Moran that were registered in meeting data are identified, and the subsequently performed while the meeting is ongoing as the participant directives recited in the claims. The combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler does not provide the performance of the actions represented by the participant directives as recited in the claims once the participant directives are identified in the recorded meeting data because Adler merely extracts words from voicemails, Ludwig merely displays a live video conferencing interface, and the activities and actions in Moran occur prior to the registration of the events in the recorded meeting data.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-49 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Moran in view of Ludwig and Adler. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Moran with the teachings of Ludwig and Adler.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-49.

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites a computer executable method for managing information during a meeting comprising steps of:

recording activities among participants during said meeting to produce recorded meeting data;

analyzing, while said meeting is ongoing, said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in said recorded meeting data, said textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on said information to be performed during said meeting; and

in response to identifying said participant directive in said recorded meeting data, performing said action represented by said participant directive on said information while said meeting is ongoing, thereby facilitating the management of information during said meeting.

As recited above, meeting data is recorded during a meeting. While the meeting is ongoing, the recorded meeting data is analyzed to identify textual content. The identified textual content is indicative of a participant directive that represents an action on information to be performed during the meeting.

Some examples of participant directives are explicit commands (e.g., “COMPUTER, display April shipping orders,” which may represent an action for printing the April shipping orders during the meeting) and implicit commands (e.g., speaking the name of a city, which may represent an action for searching for and displaying the current weather conditions of the city).

As further recited above, the action represented by the participant directive in the recorded meeting data is performed on information during the meeting. The action is performed in response to the identification of a participant directive in the recording meeting data (i.e., indicated by the textual content) while the meeting is ongoing. For example, the April shipping orders may then be displayed to the participants during the meeting in response to analysis of recorded meeting data while the meeting is ongoing that identifies textual content (e.g., “COMPUTER, display April shipping orders”).

Applicants respectfully submit that, based on the following discussion, Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the identification from recorded meeting data of participant directives in recorded meeting data during a meeting as recited in claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the performance of actions on information during a meeting where the actions are represented by participant directives identifier in textual content in recorded meeting data as recited in claim 1.

Adler

On page 4 of the Office Action, first full paragraph, the Examiner states that Moran specifically fails to teach or suggest the feature of analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention as recited in claim 1. The Examiner points to Adler's disclosure of identifying the name and telephone phone number from voicemails, as providing evidence for allegedly disclosing the above limitation. The Office Action suggests that the name or telephone number can be fairly interpreted as the participant directives recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The participant directive recited in claim 1 represents an action on information. The action recited in claim 1 is to be performed during an ongoing meeting. In contrast, data extracted from the voicemails in Adler merely represents words spoken by a caller, which are then isolated and stored (see FIG. 15 of Adler). Thus, data identified in voicemails of Adler merely represents the names, telephone numbers, and other specific pieces of information extracted from voicemails. The names and telephone numbers extracted in Adler do not teach or suggest the participant directive recited in claim 1 that represents an action to be performed during meeting.

While Adler discloses that actions may be performed using the recognized words, such as using the words as indexes in a database or using extracted data as markers in a voicemail, Adler fails to disclose that the words extracted from the voicemails themselves represent or indicate actions on information as the participant directive in textual content recited

in claim 1. Moreover, the words extracted from the voicemails in Adler do not teach or suggest actions on information to be performed during a meeting as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Adler fails to teach or suggest analyzing, while a meeting is ongoing, recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the recorded meeting data, the textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Adler fails to teach or suggest performing an action represented by a participant directive on information while a meeting is ongoing in response to identifying the participant directive in recorded meeting data as recited in claim 1. As the words extracted from the voicemails in Adler are merely indexed and stored, the words in Adler are not indicative of directives of participants of a meeting that represent actions on information to be performed while the meeting is ongoing as the participant directive recited in claim 1. Thus, Adler fails to further disclose the actual performance of any actions identified in the voicemails that are represented by participant directives in textual context as recited in claim 1.

Ludwig

On page 3 of the Office Action, first paragraph, starting with line 5, the Examiner states that Moran specifically fails to teach identifying a participant directive via “analyzing said recorded meeting data...while said meeting is ongoing.” The Examiner asserts that Moran is moot regarding actually showing FIG. 13 to participants for analysis during the meeting. The Examiner points to Ludwig’s video conferencing interface which shows multiple participants in a common interface. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to apply Ludwig to Moran, to provide the benefit of showing ongoing meeting data to participants for analyzing purposes.

In light of the Examiner’s reasoning in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully note to the Examiner that showing ongoing meeting data to participants of a meeting for the

purposes of analysis is not a limitation recited in claim 1. On the contrary, amended claim 1 recites, in part, analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention while a meeting is ongoing.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ludwig fails to teach or suggest analyzing, while a meeting is ongoing, recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the recorded meeting data, the textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's proposed motivation to combine Ludwig with Moran is deficient. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination (see In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). However, the proposed combination in effect cripples Moran, and renders Moran unsatisfactory for its intended purpose (see In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). As previously discussed, Moran is directed to permitting a user, either an attendee or a non-attendee of an activity, to replay the activity after the activity has occurred. (Moran: Summary, Col. 3, lines 33-39). In Moran, events are placed into the recorded meeting data that are a natural by product of activities occurring during the meeting.

By providing an in-meeting interface to be seen by participants, as suggested by the Examiner in a combination with Ludwig, the user in Moran is no longer provided the benefits of being able to review visual representations of the events registered during a meeting for the purposes of replaying and adding further comments to the recorded activity. (Moran: Col. 5, lines 29-33). Thus, the benefit of showing ongoing meeting data to participants for analyzing purposes suggested by the Examiner is inconsistent with the disclosure of Moran to solve the problems addressed in Moran of effectively providing meeting minutes.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Ludwig fails to teach or suggest performing an action represented by a participant directive on information while a meeting is ongoing in response to identifying the participant directive in recorded meeting data as recited in

claim 1. The Office Action merely suggests the user of Ludwig's video interface to display information to participants. However, merely displaying information to participants during a meeting, even if for the purposes of analysis as alleged by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest that an action represented by a participant directive in textual content in recorded meeting data is performed in response to the identification of the participant directive in recorded meeting data as recited in claim 1.

Moran

Applicants respectfully submit that Moran fails to teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of "analyzing, while said meeting is ongoing, said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in said recorded meeting data, said textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on said information to be performed during said meeting" and "in response to identifying said participant directive in said textual content, performing said action represented by said participant directive on said information while said meeting is ongoing, thereby facilitating the management of information during said meeting."

In regard to Moran, FIGS. 11-13 of Moran illustrate recorded meeting data in some of the following forms:

- instances where a button associated with a meeting participant has been pressed (Moran: FIG. 11, element 1124).
- events and data representing notes entered by participants (Moran: FIG. 11, elements 1122 and 1123).
- audio events when a meeting participant speaks (Moran: FIG. 11, elements 1119, 1120, and 1121).
- video events (Moran: FIG. 11, element 1125).
- moves/edits/selections on a Liveboard (Moran: FIG. 11, elements 1117 and 1118).

In the Office Action, the Examiner points to Moran's disclosure that a participant of a meeting may press a button when the participant feels that something significant is being discussed, and the instance of the button press is recorded in meeting data. (Moran: Col. 22, lines 12-18). The Examiner alleges that the reviewing of recorded meeting data by a user after the meeting to identify a tick mark indicating that a participant of the meeting pressed a button discloses the feature recited in claim 1 of "analyzing, while said meeting is ongoing, said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in said recorded meeting data, said textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on said information to be performed during said meeting." Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that Moran fails to teach or suggest where any form of recorded meeting data, such as recorded button presses or notes created by participants, is analyzed to identify textual content as recited in amended claim 1 that is indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting.

In regard to the events representing button presses in Moran, Moran discloses that a button is a device that causes the creation of an event in a "button timestream" (e.g., data being recorded during an activity) associated with a user operating the button. (Moran: Col. 13, lines 13-15). Accordingly, in Moran, during review of recorded meeting data after a meeting, a user may view the button timestream to determine whether a meeting participant pressed the button. However, Applicants respectfully submit simply looking at a button timestream to determine whether a user pushed a button during a meeting in Moran does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data to identify textual content as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, while the button presses in Moran may represent various activities, such as the beginning of a topic of interest or the participant feels something important is being said, the various activities in Moran have just started to occur (e.g., beginning of a topic of interest) or have already occurred (e.g., the participant feels something important has already been said). In contrast, the textual content recited in claim 1 indicates a participant directive that represents an action to be performed during the meeting.

Thus, not only does Moran fail to teach or suggest the analysis of recorded meeting data while the meeting is on going to identify participant directives, Moran fails to teach or suggest the performance of action represented by the participant directives recited in claim 1 while the meeting is ongoing. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Moran's disclosure of events representing button presses does not teach or suggest analyzing, while a meeting is ongoing, recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the recorded meeting data where the textual content is indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

In regard to the events and data representing notes entered by participants in Moran, Moran discloses that notes windows 404 and 405 of FIG. 4 of Moran are players used to playback notes that may have been taken on a laptop COMPUTER, or like device, that was enabled as a capture device during the course of the meeting. (Moran: Col. 18, lines 19-23). Tracks 1122-1123 of FIG. 11 of Moran indicate the start point of notes that were taken by meeting participants Adam and Charlie. When reviewing recorded meeting data in Moran, a point and click operation on visual indicators causes different things to occur. In the case of the notes, a window containing the text in the note is opened. Referring to FIG. 13 of Moran, the visual indicator 1301 has been pointed to and the switch on the cursor control device clicked. This causes a text window 1302 to be opened containing the text generated during the meeting (here the text "Good Point Made By Betty. Need to Use that Argument in Meeting With the Boss").

However, while the notes of Moran may include text generated during the meeting, the textual content of the notes of Moran is substantially different from the textual content recited in claim 1 indicative of a participant directive that represents an action to be performed during the meeting. In the specific example provided in Moran, the textual content of the note indicates a desire to act (e.g., "I need to use that argument...") on information after the meeting. However, a mere desire to act at some unspecified time which is expressed in text as in Moran is substantially different from the participant directive recited in claim 1 that represents a

specific identified action to be performed during the meeting. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Moran's disclosure of events and data representing notes entered by participants does not teach or suggest analyzing, while a meeting is ongoing, recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the recorded meeting data where the textual content is indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

In regard to the audio events when a meeting participant speaks, the video events, and the moves/edits/selections on the Liveboard, Applicants respectfully submit that Moran's disclosure does not teach or suggest analyzing, while a meeting is ongoing, recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the recorded meeting data where the textual content is indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting. Moran merely discloses that audio or video recording are another aid in creating meetings minutes. But Moran further teaches that such recordings are purely sequential and often very difficult to efficiently retrieve information from. (Moran: Col. 5, lines 15-18). To this end, Moran is directed to creating indices (e.g., events indicating when a person starts to speak) into the meeting recording of a collaborative activity that are a natural by-product of the activity itself. (Moran: Col. 5, lines 19-21).

However, Moran's disclosure does not teach or suggest analyzing the audio events, the video events, and the moves/edits/selections on the Liveboard, while a meeting is ongoing and absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in the meeting data as recorded to identify textual content that is indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information to be performed during the meeting as recited in claim 1. In Moran, the user looks for the event indicators, and then plays or listens to the recorded audio, video, and Liveboard figures. Moran fails to teach or suggest that audio, video, or the Liveboard moves are analyzed as recited in claim 1 to identify textual content. Moran also fails to teach or suggest that audio, video, or the Liveboard moves are analyzed as recited in claim 1 to identify participant directives representing actions to be performed during the meeting.

On page 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner points to the addition of events representing button presses, which are color coded to identify participants, and notes created in Moran, and asks the reader to compare with claim 1 as quoted “in response to identifying said participants [sic]...during said meeting.”

In light of the Examiner’s reasoning in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully note to the Examiner that the identification of a meeting participant is not a limitation recited in claim 1. Amended claim 1 recites, in part, in response to identifying a participant directive in recorded meeting data, performing an action represented by the participant directive on information while the meeting is ongoing, thereby facilitating the management of information during the meeting.

Thus, as recited in claim 1, once textual content indicating a participant directive is identified while a meeting is ongoing from analysis of recorded meeting data, an action to be performed during the meeting, which is represented by the participant directive, is then actually performed. In Moran, however, the user presses the button to register a button event in the button timestamp (e.g., the recorded meeting data). The action of registering the button event in the recording of the meeting data in Moran is not performed in response to the identification of textual content in recorded meeting data while the meeting is ongoing as the action recited in claim 1. Only after the meeting does another user analyze the button timestamp to identify the button presses of a user. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Moran fails to teach or suggest in response to identifying a participant directive in recorded meeting data, performing an action represented by the participant directive on information while a meeting is ongoing, thereby facilitating the management of information during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Adler and Ludwig fail to cure the deficiencies of Moran. As discussed above, Adler and Ludwig do not teach or suggest the features of “analyzing, while said meeting is ongoing, said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify textual content contained in said recorded meeting data, said textual content indicative of a participant directive representing an action on said information to be performed during said meeting” and “in response to identifying said participant directive in

said textual content, performing said action represented by said participant directive on said information while said meeting is ongoing, thereby facilitating the management of information during said meeting” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Adler and Ludwig, with Moran, fails to cure the deficiencies of Moran.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 33 and 42

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 33 and 42 are allowable for at least a similar rational as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. For example, claim 33 recites, in part, the features of “analyzing said textual information or said image information to detect attendee action cues from said audio data component or said video data component” and “accessing certain information from said information sources based on said attendee action cues.”

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 33, under a similar rational as claim 12. The Examiner alleges that adding a text note to a meeting participant’s “data feed” is synonymous with extracting text information from a continuous audio-visual recording of an attendee of a meeting as recited in claim 12, and likewise claim 33. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Merely attaching the text note to a data stream is substantially different from the extraction of text information from audio components and video components of a continuous audio-visual recording of a meeting participant as recited in claim 33. While Adler discloses extracting names and telephone numbers from voicemails (i.e., audio data), Adler does not teach or suggest extracting textual information from a video component of a continuous audio-visual recording of a meeting attendee as recited in claim 33. Ludwig and Moran also fail to teach or suggest the above limitation of extracting textual information from audio components and video components of a continuous audio-visual recording of a meeting participant as recited in claim

33. Thus, Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the detection of attendee cues in the text information recited in claim 33.

Moreover, Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest accessing certain information from information sources based on the detection of the attendee action cues in the text information extracted from the audio components and video components of a continuous audio-visual recording of a meeting participant as recited in claim 33.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 3-11 and 13-49

Applicants submit that independent claims 10, 23, 33 and 42, are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-9, 11 and 13-22, 24-32, 24-41, and 43-49 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 10, 23, 33, and 42 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Appl. No. 09/521,252
Amdt. dated April 4, 2007
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2176

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SFP:am
60891430 v1

60891430 v1